

Our efforts were signed into Public Law 87-362 by President Kennedy.

Members of both parties acclaimed this action to preserve the view from Mount Vernon, the home of George Washington.

Now we have before us the report of the Committee on Appropriations of the House. This report disallows in toto the authorization of \$937,600 to carry out the provisions of Public Law 87-362, passed less than 5 months ago.

The House Appropriations Committee report correctly states the reasons why the Congress passed Public Law 87-362. From that point the committee report appears to try to make these three points:

First. The present plans of the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission will not detract from the Mount Vernon view.

Second. Adequate planning and zoning controls now exist.

Third. The cost will be far greater than that estimated when the bill was passed a few months ago.

Before this body votes on this measure, I wish to correct the records on these points, so that the House is voting with true facts at their disposition.

The House Appropriations Committee report cites that the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission piously states that it will "refrain from further consideration of a site at Mockley Point." But the report fails to quote the next sentence from the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission publicity release which says:

"The commission believes that a treatment plant can be located at another site on the southern shore of Piscataway Bay."

Nor does the committee read further in the commission's same recent public pronouncement which says:

"The commission will not consider \* \* \* any site which adversely affects the Mount Vernon vista."

Despite this pronouncement the commission testified in the Senate only 10 days ago on the site it now contemplated.

Of course the commission testifies that the two-story structure it will build at the present will be attractive, and that a sewage treatment plant need not be obnoxious. To sanitary engineers they are the most beautiful and utilitarian structures in the world.

The House Appropriations Committee report states that the Maryland National Park and Planning Commission has recommended the new location planned by the commission for the sewage disposal plant in the lower valley of Piscataway Creek.

Again the House Appropriations Committee, in an otherwise commendable attempt to save printing costs, has treated this body to a partial quotation. The report referred to states:

"The longrange needs of the [Prince Georges] county will be better met by a plant located at Mattawoman Creek in Charles County."

The report continues:

"It would be our preference that a lagoon system be used rather than a disposal plant [at the Piscataway Bay site] with the thought that when a larger plant is ultimately located in Charles County, those sites could be abandoned as disposal plants and the lands used for park and recreation purposes."

A careful reading of the full Maryland National Park and Planning Commission report shows almost the exact opposite of the House Appropriations Committee report citations.

For example, the House Appropriations Committee report states that the area in question is under "adequate planning and zoning controls."

The same Maryland National Park and Planning Commission report has this to say on zoning controls for the area:

"We do not believe that a proper zoning plan can be developed for this area unless and until an estate and farm zone requiring 2- and 5-acre lot sizes are available."

No such classification now exists in Prince Georges or Charles Counties.

Even if such a zone classification did exist, it could not be applied to prevent a sewage plant here, or any place else. Repeated testimony before the Congress last fall showed that the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission was not subject to zoning in location of its plant, and that local government in this area has no control and no veto over the location of a sewage plant. As the Members of the House may remember, the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission in its majesty did not deign to testify before the House last summer, and refused pointblank to give a commitment to the Senate that it would not proceed to build a treatment plant while we considered the matter further. That is why the law was passed. It was the only way to stop this agency of the State, and was resorted to only after all local remedies had been tried and failed.

The House Appropriations Committee report further states:

"The acreage in question is primarily owned by three families which have held property (totaling 540 acres) for generations."

This is not even a half-truth. Public Law 87-362 refers to 1,186 acres of land along the waterfront. One-half is owned by foundations who have offered to donate their holdings to the Government without cost. Despite repeated testimony on these generous gifts, the House Appropriations Committee completely ignores this fact.

In addition, two other major waterfront landowners have told the Department of the Interior since Public Law 87-362 passed that they will donate easements on their property to the Government.

The three cited by the committee in their report are the only waterfront landowners who have objected.

The report states:

"No evidence was given to the House Appropriations Committee that these (the three cited above) plan to dispose of their property or take any action that was not in keeping with the present rural character of this area, or would not give satisfactory scenic easements."

The House Appropriations Committee chose to ignore that the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission testified before them that it is currently planning to acquire one of the three tracts for its sewage disposal plant and has the power of eminent domain to back up its decision. The owners plans have little to do with this impending change.

The House Appropriations Committee is also unaware that despite the fact that these protesting owners did not testify to this point, they have advised the Department of the Interior that they would not give any easement which would in any way restrict their right to develop their lands as they saw fit.

The House Appropriations Committee questions the adequacy of the \$937,600 authorized in Public Law 87-362 and questions the \$1,600-per-acre estimate on the 586 acres proposed for purchase in addition to the over 500 acres which will be donated outright.

This estimate was made by the Department of the Interior. It was based on the sale of a 50-acre farm in the center of the area along the river opposite Mount Vernon. This sale, which took place last summer, was a private sale between a willing seller and an informed buyer, and was at the price of \$1,300 per acre, including the house, barns, and other improvements.

Of course, the objecting families cited by the House Appropriations Committee testified that the acquisition price of their land would be much higher, but I believe that courts would hold that the fair market value is established by recent sales. One of the protesting families' representatives testified before the Senate last fall that the price would be much higher. Close questioning by the chairman of the Senate subcommittee failed to elicit any figure at all from the witness.

The House Appropriations Committee, in making this report on the purported inadequacy of the authorization, was apparently unaware that two of the major waterfront landowners have offered to donate easements on their lands to the Federal Government without cost, since Public Law 87-362 has passed. Another major landowner offered to donate easements on his waterfront lands before the bill passed. These easement donations, if accepted by Interior, would be deducted from the estimated cost of acquiring the 586 acres.

In addition, the House Appropriations Committee was apparently not aware that testimony given subsequently in the Senate showed that over one-half of the resident landowners in the Moyaone Reserve in the area covered by Public Law 87-362 have signed statements that they will donate visual easements on their property to the Federal Government without charge. The House Appropriations Committee was also unaware that several hundred acres in the Moyaone Reserve area as covered by this bill are under conservation covenants whose provisions already meet the requirements of this bill. Therefore, even where payments for scenic easements were required, the cost would be very small.

Lastly, the House Appropriations Committee makes the point of its policy that acquisition of park lands in this area is the responsibility of local jurisdictions, and suggests that the local planning commission should acquire the acreage in question if it is determined desirable or necessary.

This body should be aware that the Interior Committee in considering Public Law 87-362 made very clear in the hearings that this was not a local park bill passed for the local citizens. We, on the committee, recommend this bill unanimously to protect the view from Mount Vernon for the millions of visitors who come to the shrine from all over America and all over the world.

It must not, cannot, and will not be considered a local park bill. The support for this legislation and for the proposed appropriation which has come from all corners of the Nation, is not support of a local park bill. It is support for protection of a national shrine. I cannot believe this country is so poor that we cannot afford to protect that shrine, especially in view of the fact that private individuals are contributing such a large share of the cost.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I quote part of an editorial as recent as April 3, 1962, from the Washington Star:

Especially disappointing was the refusal of funds to preserve a large park area on the scenic Maryland shore of the Potomac opposite Mount Vernon. This action flew unaccountably in the face of a specific authorization voted by Congress after extensive hearings were held last year. In explaining the rejection, the Appropriations Committee referred to its policy that future acquisition of parklands in the Washington area should generally be the responsibility of the local jurisdictions, which enjoy some of the highest per capita incomes in the country.

The fallacy in this policy, however, is its assumption that local jurisdictions in Maryland and Virginia will provide the wherewithal not only for their local recreational

playgrounds and parks, but for those which are wholly of a national character, as part of the setting of the Federal City. This is a role which local areas of course will not fill, nor should they be expected to. There is no reasonable way in which the proposed, 1,186-acre shoreline park across from Mount Vernon can be rationalized as a local responsibility. As Congress agreed in its legislation last year, this stretch of shoreline would become a marvelous addition to the National Capital park system. It possesses historical and archaeological importance as the site of an early Indian village described by Capt. John Smith. And most important, it would preserve a view of great beauty from Mount Vernon which, unless Congress acts, most certainly will give way to bulldozers in the not-too-distant future.

Also, from the Washington Post editorial of March 24, 1962:

The public can never be sure that this national shrine has been properly safeguarded until the land on the opposite shore of the Potomac is in public ownership reserved for park purposes. The fact that last year's authorization now seems too small merely illustrates the cost of procrastination. To our way of thinking, the national interest requires this buffer park across the river from Mount Vernon, and if the House Appropriations Committee's dilatory tactics should prevail the site may ultimately cost several times its present price.

There have been actions taken by the Congress in the past that required vision and courage. One of these gave us Rock Creek Park. I wonder what this Capital city would be without it. Certainly the thousands upon thousands who come here each year are proud that their Capital is so surrounded. Have we lost our vision, Mr. Speaker, here on the Hill? Certainly our people across the country even to Alaska and Hawaii have not lost theirs, or there would not have been a unanimous vote in both Houses to authorize this acquisition of land across the Potomac from the home of President Washington. More and more people, as they realize that their Representatives did not have the courage to carry through this national demand, will insist upon the protection they consider both valid and necessary for this small area on the Potomac River. No, the matter is not ended, and the error many from all areas of the United States who will watch every move made in the area lest damage be done.

The Congress should also note the following organizations, both local and national, that are actively supporting this move to protect the environs of Mount Vernon:

#### LOCAL GROUPS

The Accokeek Civic Association.  
The Calvert Manor Civic Association.  
The Moyaone Reserve Civic Association.  
The Piscataway Hills Civic Association.  
The Alice Ferguson Foundation will donate land.  
The Accokeek Foundation will donate land.  
The Swan Creek Citizens Association.  
The majority of local landowners have signed a statement that they will donate easements.

#### NATIONAL GROUPS

Citizens Committee on Natural Resources.

Izaak Walton League of America.  
Mount Vernon Ladies Association.  
National Audubon Society.  
National Wildlife Federation.  
National Trust for Historic Preservation.  
Wild Life Management Institute.  
Wilderness Society.  
The General Federation of Womens Clubs.

#### LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Prince Georges County commissioners of the State of Maryland.  
Governor and Legislature of the State of Virginia.

Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission.

That this may be as complete as possible this record should note at least the following editorials supporting this law which have been sent to Mount Vernon in addition to literally hundreds of news stories:

The Harrisburg (Pa.) Patriot, June 14, 1961; the Alexandria Gazette, July 18, 1961; the Des Moines Register, July 24, 1961; the Baltimore Evening Sun, August 2, 1961; the St. Paul Pioneer Press, August 3, 1961, and March 29, 1962; the Savannah Evening Press, August 9, 1961; the Boston Sunday Herald, August 20, 1961; the Augusta Herald, August 23, 1961; the Raleigh News & Observer, August 27, 1961; the Richmond Times Dispatch, August 30, 1961; the Charlotte News, September 4, 1961; the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner, September 14, 1961; the Washington Post, September 19, 1961; the Washington Star, September 25, 1961; and the Covington Virginian, February 7, 1962.

#### COMMUNISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] is recognized for 60 minutes.

(Mr. DULSKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, today as never before we are faced with the stark reality that communism is an ever-increasing threat to our Nation.

In recent years we have witnessed the struggle that has taken place in other countries in this hemisphere. Only 90 miles from our shores the Communists have overrun Cuba. We would be foolish to think it could not happen elsewhere—even right here in the United States.

We believe all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights. The doctrine of communism denies this. Philosophically, communism is a complete throwback. It is a return to barbarism.

The Communist assault on the foundation of our Government goes on day after day without end. Our laws, particularly those pertaining to our security, are principal targets of Communist subversion.

What can we do to combat these Communist assaults? For one thing, we should all know more about it. We

must study communism, learn its basic doctrines, its strategies and tactics, its approach to current national and international affairs.

This was the purpose of the cold war seminar recently sponsored by the Buffalo Jaycees in Buffalo, N.Y. If we have knowledge of what communism stands for, what it proposes to do, and how it plans to accomplish its purpose, we will not become its stooges, and we can successfully attack and thwart this menace.

In 1958, an Institute for American Strategy was organized for the purpose of educating the American people as to the profound strategic problems facing this Nation, and to offer positive programs for helping to meet them.

Cold war seminars were inaugurated by this institute to stimulate and encourage research and public study of the technical, ideological, economic, military and moral factors in the protracted conflict between the free world and the totalitarian Sino-Soviet axis.

More than 4,000 speeches have been made at these seminars during the past few years by institute advised programs.

Last year the Buffalo Junior Chamber of Commerce was asked to conduct a cold war seminar in Buffalo. The Buffalo Jaycees, believing that this would provide area educators, businessmen, Reserve and National Guard reservists with a comprehensive grasp of the global conflict between the free and Communist worlds, and of the original resources and methods used by the Communists to achieve their aim of world domination, made the necessary arrangements, and the seminar was held in Buffalo on March 30 and 31, 1962.

The Jaycees also plan to develop objective discussion and understanding of the requirements for successful U.S. strategies, plans and programs in support of free world military, political and economic security. American traits and ideals will be explored, and also how our beliefs can be preserved and fulfilled in harmony with the aspirations of other free people.

Months of preparation went into this seminar, under the able direction of Mr. John R. Owen, Jr., general chairman. Mr. Owen, born and educated in Buffalo, is employed as a representative of the Whitmer & Ferris Co. in Buffalo. He has served in the Army, saw duty in Korea, and holds the Army Commendation Ribbon with Medal Pendant. He is presently assigned to the Buffalo USAR School as the unit's sergeant major. As a member of the Buffalo Junior Chamber of Commerce, he was an adviser to the Junior Achievement of the Niagara Frontier.

The honorary chairman for this seminar was B. John Tutuska, sheriff of Erie County. Mr. Tutuska was born and educated in Buffalo and joined the Buffalo Police Department in 1946. Sheriff Tutuska has been very active in this field, and on many occasions has called the public's attention to the threat of communism and Communist infiltration in our community. He is a strong believer in our American heritage and rights of all citizens in a democracy.

1962

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

645

I had the privilege of attending this seminar, and I want to commend Mr. Owen on the splendid job he did in making this a success and procuring outstanding speakers. Some of the speakers traveled hundreds of miles to address the seminar.

Under the chairmanship of Mr. Martin J. Travers, senior vice president of the Marine Trust Co., the Strategy Seminar was opened by welcoming ceremonies, followed by the keynote address which was delivered by the Honorable MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, a Member of Congress from Ohio.

Mr. FEIGHAN was born in Ohio and educated at Princeton and Harvard where he received his law degree in 1931. Representative FEIGHAN has been in public life since 1937, when he was elected a member of the Ohio State Legislature. He has been a Member of the United States House of Representatives since 1942. Representative FEIGHAN is an authority on the enslavement of the non-Russian nations in the Communist empire and their rights to national sovereignty and independence. He is a member of the House Judiciary Committee, since 1943, serving on the Immigration Subcommittee. He is also a member of a Select Committee of the House of Representatives, 83d Congress, to investigate Communist aggression. Mr. FEIGHAN has received many awards and honors, a few of which are King of Greece awarded him the Grant Cross of the Royal Order of Phoenix; honorary degree of doctor of political science, University of Munich; awarded Vigilant Patriot Honor Plaque by All-American Conference To Combat Communism. The President of the Italian Republic conferred the Cross of Knight Commander upon him for his interest in the problems of emigration. Congressman FEIGHAN was also awarded the Freedom Plaque for Distinguished Service by the United Anti-Communist Action Committee of Western New York, July 20, 1960. In January 1962, he was elected Hibernian of the Year.

Congressman FEIGHAN's address appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 3, 1962, on page A2590.

This was followed by a movie, "Communist Encirclement," sponsored by the United Anti-Communist Committee of Western New York.

Dr. Anthony Bouscaren, professor of political science at Le Moyne College, Syracuse, N.Y., spoke on the subject, "Soviet Challenge and Free World Response." Dr. Bouscaren has lectured at the National War College, Naval War College, Command and General Staff College, and other military commands and posts. He is a nationally prominent authority on communism, and has authored many books. One, "A Guide to Anti-Communist Action," with J. Edgar Hoover's "Masters of Deceit," was recommended by the American Bar Association's 1958 Committee on Communist Strategy, Tactics and Objectives. Other books include: "Soviet Expansion and the West," "Imperial Communism," "America Faces World Communism," and "Modern Ideologies." He has written a number of articles for leading pub-

lications. Dr. Bouscaren has also received several awards, including the Freedoms Foundation, Wisconsin DAR Award, and the Christopher Award.

The afternoon session of the first day was chaired by Mr. Russell F. Kleinhans, State chairman of the national purpose project, New York State Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Brig. Gen. S. L. A. Marshall, U.S. Army, retired, who was Deputy Chief of Information, U.S. Army, from 1951 until he retired last August, spoke on the topic "Military Preparations and Policies."

He was followed by Rev. Joseph Cantillon, of Canisius College. Reverend Cantillon, speaking on the "United States and the United Nations," made a great contribution outlining the features of the United Nations program. He stressed why it was very important for the United States to keep its voice in the United Nations. He cited a number of fine examples in his lecture.

Dr. Charles Wesley Lowry, D.D., president of the Foundation for Religious Action in the Social and Civil Order, delivered a talk on "Communism and Christianity."

Dr. Lowry was Episcopal chaplain, University of California, 1949-50. In 1952 he represented the United States at the first International Convention on Peace and Christian Civilization in Florence, Italy. During 1956 he received a special audience by Pope Pius XII and lectured in England and France. In 1959 he was elected president of the American Peace Society.

Mr. Mark F. Soukup, member of the board of directors, Buffalo Jaycees, was chairman of the morning session on the second day of the seminar.

A movie, "Challenge of Ideas," prepared by the U.S. Information Office, was shown.

"The Civil Defense Problem" was the title of Mr. Richard P. Draine's address.

Mr. Draine is presently Director of Training, Education and Public Affairs of the Department of Defense—Civil Defense Region I at Harvard, Mass. He is a graduate of the University of Chicago and the Chicago Teachers College.

Mr. Stuart L. Hannon, of Radio Free Europe, spoke next on "Why the Russians Win."

Mr. Hannon is presently the Staff Assistant, Office of the President of the Free Europe Committee—Radio Free Europe.

Prior to his present position, he served for 9 years with the Department of the Army and the U.S. Foreign Service in England, Luxembourg, Germany, Greece, and Switzerland. At the end of World War II, Mr. Hannon was assigned by military government to Radio Stuttgart to help direct the rebuilding of the former Reichs sender into a democratic, public service institution. In 1947 he became Chief of the Information Control Division in Baden-Wuerttemberg. In 1948, during the period of Communist guerrilla warfare in Greece, he was sent on a special assignment to Athens. Under the U.S. High Commissioner, John J. McCloy, Mr. Hannon became the Director of the Public Affairs Division in south Germany. In September 1952 he

was reassigned to the U.S. Embassy in Bern as Public Affairs Officer for Switzerland. On behalf of Radio Free Europe and Crusade for Freedom, Mr. Hannon makes regular lecture tour throughout the United States.

Col. William R. Kintner, U.S. Army (Ret.) chose as his topic for this seminar, "Strategy for the Sixties."

Dr. Kintner is deputy director, Foreign Policy Research Institute, University of Pennsylvania. He has written many articles and authored and co-authored many books: "Forging a New Sword," "Protracted Conflict," "A Forward Strategy for America," and "The New Frontier of War." Colonel Kintner has been awarded the Legion of Merit, Bronze Star (OLC) (V). Colonel Kintner is a graduate of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point.

Rev. Stephen Gerencser, headmaster of Calasancius Preparatory School in Buffalo, spoke on "Education: Russian and the United States."

Reverend Gerencser obtained American citizenship in September 1954. He was educated in Hungary and obtained his Ph. D. and S.T.D. at the University of Budapest. Reverend Gerencser's activities are well known in the fields of psychology, philosophy of religion, and education, and he has published several books and articles. He speaks Hungarian, German, Latin, French, Catalan, Greek, and English.

In the afternoon, the seminar was chaired by Judge William J. Regan.

"Disarmament and Its Prospects" was discussed by Ambassador Jacob D. Beam, of the State Department.

Dr. Lev Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, delivered a lecture on "Soviet Russian Weaknesses and Vulnerabilities."

Dr. Dobriansky is presently a professor of economics at Georgetown University. He has had a brilliant career in education and public service. Dr. Dobriansky authored the Captive Nations Week resolution (Public Law 86-90) and has received frequent testimonies in the U.S. Congress since 1948. He has received many honors: Charles Hayden Memorial Scholar, Hirschland Political Science Fellowship, Freedom's Foundation Award, and holds an honorary LL.D. from Munich. His published works include: "Veblenism a New Critique," "The Free Trade Ideal," "Discussion for a Better America," "The Great Pretense," "The Crimes of Khrushchev," and "Europe's Freedom Fighter: Tara Shevchenko."

Dr. Dobriansky's lecture follows:

#### SOVIET RUSSIAN WEAKNESSES AND VULNERABILITIES

(By Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky)

The authorities of the University of Buffalo, the membership of the Buffalo Junior Chamber of Commerce, and others responsible for this important cold war seminar deserve the highest praise and admiration not only from the citizens of this Greater Buffalo area but also from our people throughout the country. It is a distinct privilege for me to participate in this seminar because the ideas, perspectives, and judgments exchanged here will undoubtedly make themselves felt in other parts of our Nation, not to say in several quarters of the globe. If

you think this is simply a flowery introduction to my subject, then just ponder the fact that the intense activity shown by the city of Buffalo in the annual observance of Captive Nations Week has had a continuous impact not only on other major cities in the United States but also, in another way, upon the imperio-colonial city of Moscow.

It is plainly evident to every alert citizen that never before has the relationship of commercial and industrial enterprises, military preparation, educational effort, and governmental conduct been more interlaced and interdependent than in our time. The proceedings of this seminar clearly reflect the chief aspects of this basic pattern, and its results, bearing on cold war problems, cannot but prove to be salutary for alert citizenship, for popular interest in our foreign policy, for our will and determination to win the cold war. As I view it, this seminar is a people's forum for a free exchange of ideas, for the flow of data and facts which many of our newspapers, periodicals, and other media fail to bring to public light, for constructive evaluation and also criticism of the policies of our Government. This is intellectual democracy in action. And surely one of our most responsible tasks is to gain an understanding of the strength, weaknesses, and vulnerabilities of the Soviet Russian adversary.

#### THE STRENGTH-WEAKNESS-VULNERABILITY FORMULA—(SWV)

In analyzing the Soviet Russian colossus it is necessary to distinguish at the outset between weakness and vulnerability. The two are not identical and should not be confused. A weakness is a condition of defect and impairment which does not in itself constitute a vulnerability. For it to develop into this state requires an active external agent, a stimulus seeking to take advantage of the condition. No doubt there are many deep and open weaknesses in the totalitarian Soviet Russian Empire, but so long as they remain untapped—indeed, in many critical instances unnoticed and even ignored—they cannot by logical definition be deemed as vulnerabilities. Thus, in terms of a working formula of thought, policies of patched-up containment, evolution, and wishful thinking on the coming break-up of the so-called Communist bloc serve only to guarantee the inconvertibility of imperial Soviet Russian weaknesses into vulnerabilities. The active external agent, the powerful stimulus or catalyst, is lacking.

Now there is little difficulty in taking an item-by-item inventory of weaknesses in the Soviet Union and enumerating them in the ideologic, political, economic, sociologic, military, and other spheres of this substrate empire. Essentially, this bookkeeping approach would be meaningless, devoid of perspective and weighted proportion, and virtually useless for pragmatic objectives in our struggle for survival. By far the more effective and meaningful way is to rank the paramount points of weakness and possible vulnerability in some order of logical importance, revealing the main and crucial spots of each in a particular critical area.

What significantly results from this realistic approach is the strength-weakness vulnerability formula. According to this formula, the points of Soviet Russian strength increase in some direct proportion to our failure to convert its weaknesses into vulnerabilities and can substantially decrease in inverse proportion to our success in staging such conversions. The prodigious irony of the current situation is the fact that beneath the surface of most Soviet Russian accomplishments and points of strength rest their most profound weaknesses.

As will be shown by concrete fact and experience, rather than by dangling theory or speculation, it is my aim here to emphasize

one area of strength and also actual weakness over others. This is not because I am especially attracted to this area. Rather, it is because this most critical area still is quite vague and unfamiliar to most Americans; it is because in history, logic, and strategy the area of totalitarian Soviet Russian domination and influence over the two dozen captive non-Russian nations from the Danube to the Pacific still is the primary battleground between the forces of freedom and totalitarian imperialism. The areas of southeast Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America are only secondary and tertiary battlegrounds of the enemy's choosing. Further plans and expenditures to mend the fences of freedom in these areas are, to be sure, necessary, but they are also, in the context of the cold war, expressions of inadequacy under a shortsighted policy of patched-up containment.

#### THE PERMANENT COLD WAR CONTEXT

To assess with meaning and a ruling sense of proportion the strength and real weaknesses of imperialist Soviet Russia, it is indispensable for us to bear constantly in mind the permanent cold war context. Outside of this existential context, predicated by the backward political institutions of Russia itself, the accomplishments and weaknesses of Moscow fall short of significant meaning. As some of us have taught for over a decade, we should consciously recognize that, given our own military buildup, the future will not be one of any global military holocaust involving the insecure forces of Moscow. Instead, it will be one of more or less intense cold war activity whereby the Russian totalitarians will seek in the best tradition of Russian empire-building to frustrate and sap the will and determination of their targeted victims.

Looking back over the past 17 years, one would be justified in writing a book on our foreign policy under the title "From Air Supremacy and Atomic Monopoly to Creeping National Self-Paralysis." This is not a pretty title, but neither is our sad record of losing the peace and also parts of the free world piece by piece twice in this century. Rarely in the history of mankind has a country spent so much in life and treasure for peace and freedom, and yet has lost so much in so little time than our Nation since World War II. Policies have their results and consequences, and ours have spelled increasing failure to halt the enemy, no less defeat him. There is not only no indication of any necessary substantial change in our policy today but also no evidence of a complete grasp of Russian cold war activity.

When we focus our attention on the major strengths and also weaknesses of the Soviet Union and Moscow's extended empire, let us keep reminding ourselves of the real "ifs" of history as well as the "whens." If President Wilson had an accurate knowledge and understanding of the Czarist Russian Empire, there can be no doubt that he would have listened to the French and applied the basic principle of national self-determination to all the non-Russian nations in that empire. The mythology of communism and the reality of Russian imperio-colonialism would surely have been but echoes in the arena of contemporary history. If President Roosevelt had understood the makeup of the Soviet Russian empire, under the legalistic disguise of the U.S.S.R., there also can be no doubt that he would have utilized our overwhelming power to place Moscow under increasing pressures of freedom. Instead, duped by Moscow's skillful propaganda and diplomacy, he acquiesced to the power-politic thought of dividing the world into spheres of influence. As the files of Cardinal Spellman show: "China gets the far East; the United States, the Pacific; Britain and Russia, Europe and Africa. But as Britain has predominantly colonial interests,

it might be assumed that Russia will predominate in Europe."

And, as I shall show, our operational understanding of Moscow's colonial empire, and its effective techniques haven't improved much since. This situation has certainly a source of tremendous comfort and encouragement to Moscow and its quiescent puppets. It indicates to them that if they can largely realize their 7-year and other plans, if they can improve and expand their military hardware, if for propaganda and other reasons they can continue their spectacular explorations into space, they will enjoy even greater successes in the cold war with the diverse instruments and resources produced in these fields. Through these means and more they will, in time, expand their empire, whether it will be in the Middle East, Asia, Africa, or Latin America, and at the same time avoid any hot global conflict. After all, part of their totalitarian empire lies only 90 miles from our southern border.

Cuba is an actual example. But for a possible example, if as a result of Russian-supported subversion and agitation Iran falls under the process of an overtake, ask yourselves what really could we do? Would you send SAC or the marines in there? Would you employ nuclear weapons? In short, with all our armaments and economic handouts, aren't we neutralized on the world scale by the special type of cold war activity Moscow wages? The sudden discovery of the uses of guerrilla warfare—10 years after many of us advocated it in connection with the captive nations—is on this scale an open invitation to miniature Koreans along the broad front of the free world.

The techniques of Russian cold war activity are in form and substance old techniques. They are scarcely the creation of self-designated Communists. They are in essence the techniques by which Russian imperio-colonialists were able to build up an unprecedented empire in the past, from Ivan the Terrible down to 1917, and the present empire is a continuation and expansion of the past one. As then, so now, they skillfully utilize deceptive ideologies to mask themselves and their colonialist movements; as then, so now, they employ Potemkin Village tactics, whether in the military field, the economic, diplomatic, or even athletic, to disarray, confuse, and frighten their targeted victims; as then, so now, they make full use of conspiratorial, infiltrative, subversive, and blackmail methods. These techniques of incessant cold war aggression are plainly not the products of irrelevant Marxism or of Pavlovian psychology. They are the fashioned tools of centuries of cumulative experience in successful empire-building.

The real decision before this Nation today is not whether to push or not to push into space, to disarm or not to disarm, to negotiate or not to negotiate, to trade or not to trade with the Red Empire. Instead, the basic and real decision is whether to meet or not to meet the full cold war challenge of colonial Moscow. Once we make this decision, all other subordinate decisions will fall into place. When and if the real decision is placed before this Nation and we should resolve seriously to engage the enemy in the total context of the cold war, it wouldn't and couldn't be a matter of fighting this war only on our side of the 50-yard line. In any league the best defense is the offense, and it should be obvious that the defense of freedom is being battered from Laos to Cuba because our mere defensive and reactive posture is not the best defense.

Where, then, do Soviet Russian achievements and correlative weaknesses enter into this analytic framework? Quite clearly, a

<sup>1</sup>"The Cardinal Spellman Story," Look magazine, Mar. 13, 1962, vol. 26, No. 6.



1962

cold war offensive would not permit Moscow's imperialism to nibble away at us, for such an offensive necessitates the conversion of well-known weaknesses in the enemy's empire into vulnerabilities and the systematic exploitation of these vulnerabilities toward his eventual destruction. We would have to seize upon these formed vulnerabilities with the same caution, skill and courage as they do in the free world, this despite the overhanging presence of thermonuclear weapons. Put in another way, we must study the weaknesses and the associated achievements of the avowed enemy to convert them into vulnerabilities which can be exploited for our national self-preservation and the survival of freedom. The manifest irony of our present situation is that we wouldn't think twice about attending to this necessity if we were suddenly catapulted into a hot global war, but in the more insidious cold war of our time this necessity is being virtually overlooked. Instead, some seem to content themselves with philosophical exhortations about the spreading disease of freedom and the human penchant for diversity.

#### THE IDEOLOGICO-PROPAGANDA SWF

There are five major areas for our analysis: (1) the ideologico-propaganda; (2) the empire; (3) the so-called economic race; (4) the military-space field; and (5) the party apparatus. Applying to each our working formula of strength-weakness-vulnerability, let us consider the first, the ideologico-propaganda. The strength of Moscow's ideologico-propaganda drive is admitted as being superior by most students of the subject. Moscow's tremendous feat in this all-encompassing area is the sustained impression and opinion generated in too many parts of the free world that a new way of life, a new philosophy, and new methods and operations of social order are represented by the Soviet Union and other sectors of Moscow's empire. The way of life is socialism in transition to communism; the philosophy is Marxism-Leninism with unspecified revisions now and then; and the new methods and operations are ostensibly the products of a planned economy. Our personalist way of life, our democratic philosophy, and our capitalist methods and operations stand in contradiction to these essentials of so-called Soviet society.

With his grandiloquent and constant babble Khrushchev has enlarged this ideologico-propaganda achievement by convincing many unsuspecting Americans and others that the momentous contest is between two social systems—socialism versus capitalism—in the atmosphere of peaceful coexistence. We are supposed to be in an economic and technologic race, the outcome of which is predestined by Moscow's interpretation of history. As in the case of Hitler and his 1,000 years of the New Order, the Russian totalitarians see themselves riding the wave of the future.

To prevent this, we spend considerable time, capital, and energy in the simple belief that we are fighting international communism or, at best, Communist imperialism. Clouding up the situation further is the notion that our adversary is "the Soviets"—mind you, councils of workers and peasants. No one will deny here that to confuse, deceive, and distract your chosen opponent is a basic accomplishment in and of itself. As concerns the nature of the struggle and its manifold ramifications, the Russian totalitarians have succeeded in this with us. In the past Russian tyrants cloaked their totalitarian rule and imperialist conquests with equally spurious ideologies of super-religious orthodoxy and racist pan-Slavicism. Today it is millenarian communism, interspersed at times with these old ideologies in what suits the occasion.

We have uncritically accepted this and inadvertently impute philosophic respectability

and dignity to what is essentially not the ideology but the mythology of communism. The pendulumic swings of attitude in the United States, viewing the Russians as 4 footers at one time and then 11-footers at another, indicate both our uncertainty of knowledge and susceptibility to Moscow's manipulation of half or isolated truths. On the one hand, we deprecate Moscow's activities in Asia, Africa, and Latin America as "mere propaganda," while, on the other hand, we complain that our story is not reaching the university students and the peoples of these areas. We have still to appreciate the central importance and significance of propaganda in the cold war. The heirs of Pushkin, Tolstoy, Dostoyevsky, and other practical psychologists have remarkably developed this basic art to make a relatively backward state appear as a prime contender to the slumbering American giant, to make the worst empire of its kind appear as the great proponent of national liberation and independence, and to move the minds of millions throughout the world in the belief that all this is so.

However, the weaknesses of Moscow's ideologico-propaganda are deep and fundamental. These have been time and time disclosed by experience and events, not theory or speculation. After 20 years of so-called indoctrination millions of Ukrainians, Georgians, Russians, and others deserted colonial Moscow in World War II; after 10 years of heavy propaganda Hungarian students and workers staged the 1956 revolution, shouting, "Russky, go home"; after years of enslavement in the Vorkuta, Karaganda, and other labor correction camps, inmates of all different nations struck for freedom. These are only a few of the hundreds of examples proving the utter bankruptcy of what we uncritically call Communist ideology. Without iron curtains, walls, and the oppressive apparatus of totalitarian rule this existential bankruptcy would come into full bloom, the Hitlerian totalitarian and imperialist nature of so-called communism would be clear to all, this Trojan horse of thought and weapon of deception with no basic relevancy to 19th-century Marxism would become transparent even to the newly independent nations and peoples who know little about Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism.

Nevertheless, Moscow continues to capitalize on this massive deception chiefly because of our failure to develop these weaknesses into critical vulnerabilities. Such development requires a realization of the central importance of propaganda—a forceful, well-planned propaganda of truth and fact—and also a grasp of the real nature of the threat stemming from Eastern Europe. Our Voice of America is but a pygmy compared to Moscow's media. Worse still, the policies of USIA run counter to the task of developing vulnerabilities in the U.S.S.R. For example, 4 years ago, by virtue of congressional hearings, the USIA was stopped in its attempt to curtail and eliminate Lithuanian, Ukrainian, Georgian, and other non-Russian broadcasts to the U.S.S.R.<sup>2</sup> It sought to have the captive non-Russian peoples listen in the language of their Moscow captor. Today, again, this attempt is being made to appease Moscow.

The opportunities for demolishing the image Moscow casts of its empire are many. For one, we could easily show the theoretic Russian perversion of Marxism and the vacuity of so-called Communist ideology. Points on economic determinism, the technocratic elite in the U.S.S.R., the appeal to underdeveloped areas in the name of socialism, surplus value and economic and colonial exploitation in the Soviet Union, state

<sup>2</sup> "Review of U.S. Information Agency," Committee on Foreign Affairs, September-October 1958, Washington, D.C., pp. 102-122.

versus society, are only a few to establish the Russian mythology of communism. As one writer recently put it: "Bolshivism evidently stems from the traditional messianic and universalist outlook of the Russian revolutionary intelligentsia which fastened upon Marxism as an instrument of its own will to 'change the world'." The fact is that Soviet Russian mythology is a Comtean impulse to reorganize wholesale the societies of other nations in the image of backward and barbarian Russian institutions.<sup>4</sup> The combination of oppressive institutions and modern technology, the latter largely the creation of the West, has produced a mythology which in every fundamental respect is Hitlerian totalitarianism.

If we are to win the cold war, we must recognize and repeatedly stress the real threat which Soviet Russian mythology conceals. And this is the Soviet Russian imperio-colonial system of totalitarian rule. Make no mistake about this. This is not a matter of academic theorization and speculation. As I'll show in connection with our second area, it has been successfully tested and, indeed, more tests are in order so that this fundamental truth would be ingrained in the minds of our people and the people of the world. It is scarcely comforting to learn, alas, that we are fighting against a mythology, but it is reassuring to know that along with all the captive nations in Moscow's empire we have pierced through the mythological facade of communism to the real enemy, Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism.

Our most powerful weapon against this last remaining empire in the world is the ideology, the system of ideas and truths, embodied in our own Declaration of Independence. About 10 years ago we called for a universalization of the Declaration, aimed particularly at the captive non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union.<sup>5</sup> The evidence of this past decade proves the soundness of this position. However, when we find Secretary of State Rusk declaring in a letter to the House Rules Committee last August that Ukraine, Armenia, and Georgia are traditional parts of the Soviet Union, meaning, in effect, that we should not disturb Moscow's eminent domain over these captive areas, we cannot but wonder about the understanding and vision of some of our leaders.<sup>6</sup> Three months later Ambassador Stevenson in a U.N. declaration talks about an independent Ukrainian Republic, about an Armenia that declared its independence in 1918, about the independent state of Georgia.<sup>7</sup> It is such confusion of thought that inhibits us from converting a major weakness into a critical vulnerability. It is such cross-purpose operation that causes men like Madariaga to say, "This is a war of ideas, brains, and heart. The West's foreign policy is passive and flaccid. It will never get an understanding with Russia. How about Russian imperialism? It's the worst imperialism the world has ever known \* \* \*."<sup>8</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Lichtheim, George, "Marxism, An Historical and Critical Study," New York, 1961, p. 398.

<sup>4</sup> Dobriansky, Lev E., "Veblenism: A New Critique," Public Affairs Press, Washington, D.C., 1957, pp. 85-86.

<sup>5</sup> "Universalized Declaration of Independence: America's New World Revolution," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 18, 1953, A781-82.

<sup>6</sup> "State Proves the Necessity of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 7, 1962, p. 8265.

<sup>7</sup> "Spotlight on Moscow's Imperio-Colonialism," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 7, 1962, p. 3251.

<sup>8</sup> Salvador de Madariaga, Washington Post, May 26, 1961.

638

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

April 18

## MOSCOW'S EXPANDED EMPIRE

Well, how about Russian imperialism? The second general area of Moscow's obvious strength is its expanded empire. Contrary to much current wishful thinking about Red China and Albania, about "the slow fragmentation of the Communist bloc," the Soviet Russian empire continue to consolidate itself in substantial terms of economic integration, military accretion, and an expedient exploitation of nationalist forces. One of Moscow's paramount goals in the past 5 years has been to gain Western acquiescence to the permanence of its present empire, and our increasing indifference toward the captive nations has helped in this.

Since its accidental inception in 1917, Soviet Russia has reduced to captivity one non-Russian nation after another. The history of Soviet Russian conquest began with most of the nations now held in bondage within the Soviet Union itself—White Ruthenia, Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, Turkestan, and others—and this process, either directly or indirectly, continues in Cuba, South Vietnam, Laos, Iran, and elsewhere.<sup>9</sup> The most significant development in all areas of the empire is the emphasis placed on the old formula, "national in form, socialist in content." To attract the instinctive nationalist forces in Poland, Ukraine, Hungary, Azerbaijan, Turkestan, North Korea to the global ambitions of Moscow, the Russian totalitarians are accommodating themselves to the stress of national heroes and events of the past. In this they hope to prove that the future of these captive nations rests with them rather than "the imperialist powers" of the West. Moscow exploits past and present national grievances to its own advantage, constantly telling Poles and Ukrainians, for example, about the German atrocities of the past and constantly reminding Azerbaijani and Armenians about their claims against Iran and Turkey, respectively.

Moscow plays every angle to strengthen its hold on the empire, on both the internal captives within the Soviet Union and the outer captives outside it. Feelings of pan-slavism, religious orthodoxy, national pride, past hatreds and national uncertainty toward the future are exploited. Disagreement with Red China and Albania is more of a proof of this overall tendency of expedient accommodation than of any basic disintegrative tendency. Whether in Georgia or Azerbaijan or Ukraine or Turkestan, Khrushchev often has tried to persuade the non-Russian nationals there that they are "independent."

Those who today preach that the Soviet Russian Empire is showing signs of disintegration, that the future is with us, that all that is required is a military buildup and trade with this empire, are gravely misleading the citizens of this country. There is no substantial evidence of this. In fact, all the important and basic evidence of increasing empire strength points the other way. Of course Moscow has its problems. Who doesn't? It had even graver problems at Stalin's death, during the Hungarian Revolution, but it nonetheless continued to build up its composite power.

Yet beneath the surface of this imperial power and strength lies the most profound weakness of the Soviet Union and of the entire structure of Moscow's imperial rule and power. This weakness is the immense latent power of genuine patriotic nationalism, both within and outside the Soviet Union. This weakness is so deep that despite his public disclaimers of Stalinist terrorism, Khrushchev deemed it necessary to have two Ukrainian nationalist leaders in exile raur-

dered.<sup>10</sup> It is this power of patriotic nationalism which is our most formidable weapon against Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism, not the superficial disagreements between puppets and the prime power.

Despite the unmistakable clues given by Khrushchev himself, we have yet to translate this fundamental weakness into a vulnerability. The most important and conclusive test of my observation here is Khrushchev's haunting fear of any implementation of the Captive Nations Week Resolution, passed by Congress in 1959. Except for the U-2 incident, no event in the past 10 years has had as great an impact on Moscow as this resolution. Our Presidents and others have spoken in behalf of some of the captive nations before 1959, but this produced no sensitive reaction from Moscow. It was only when Congress included all the captive nations, meaning the majority of them in the Soviet Union, that Khrushchev and his puppets exploded. And they have been erupting over this ever since because they know, if we do not, the disastrous effects that a methodic implementation of this resolution could have on their worldwide propaganda operations and on the nations within their empire.

Let me cite just one example of how our opinionmakers interpret this resolution. In an article a few months ago Stewart Alsop wrote, "When I was in Moscow during the October Party Congress, Khrushchev once again violently denounced the innocuous Captive Nations Week Resolution which Congress passes every year to attract minority votes."<sup>11</sup> I wonder how an informed and intelligent American reader reacts to this stroke of logic and fantasy. Very simply, if the resolution is truly innocuous, why should Khrushchev, the leader of the supposed second largest power in the world, again violently denounce this resolution? As to the other parts of this fantastic observation, the resolution is self-renewing and thus is not passed every year, nor had its bipartisan passage any relation to minority votes. Is it any wonder that we are losing the cold war?

## THE ECONOMIC ILLUSION

Turning now to the economic area, it should be readily recognized that for cold war objectives the empire economy of the Soviet Union is strong, secure, and increasingly threatening. The usual comparisons about their surpassing us in this or that are of barren meaning, a source of much economic illusion. The U.S.S.R. economy is and always has been a war economy in essence. With a gross imperial product of only about 40 percent of our GNP, with an industrial output of about 45 percent of ours and requiring over 20 percent more labor, with an agricultural output below ours by one-third and requiring 50 percent of their labor force as against 10 percent of ours, with available goods and services only 33 percent of ours and on a per capita basis only 25 percent of ours, and with the inevitable problems of growth yet to be experienced by them, Moscow has a long way to go to match our economy even in its present state. However, being a totalitarian and essentially a war economy, the U.S.S.R. poses an increasing threat as \$12 to \$20 billion of additional output becomes annually available to it for cold and hot war purposes.

Weaknesses in this economy are many, but most fundamental are the disparities of real income and status between the new class of the ruling elite and party functionaries and underlying population, and also the rampant economic colonialism to which the captive non-Russian peoples are subjected. In com-

bination with the other weaknesses, these can be transformed into vulnerabilities as we concentrate on the Russian people and the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. Such concentration by way of focusing worldwide attention and opinion on these two paramount economic weaknesses would provide important political leverage to the liberal Russian and nationalist non-Russian forces within the U.S.S.R.

Again, to cite an example, there are today some 40 resolutions in the House Rules Committee calling for the creation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.<sup>12</sup> One of the main objectives of this committee would be to study and make known the scope and depth of Moscow's economic colonialism in the Soviet Union. These measures seek to implement the Captive Nations Week resolution, but so far the leadership and the administration have resisted such a step, despite all the evidence of Moscow's troubled concern over such implementations.<sup>13</sup>

## THE MILITARY-SPACE SWV

Perhaps even clearer and more distinct SWV aspects appear in the military-space field. The general and specific strength of the U.S.S.R. in this area are the consummate result of top priority allocation in this war economy. Matching in dollar volume our total military expenditures, over 20 percent of the gross product in the U.S.S.R. goes to military pursuits. Every weapon, every means, from ICBM's to pistols, receives high qualitative and quantitative development. In space exploration, tremendously expensive in itself, Moscow has, as we know, made an early start under the rule of inordinate concentration. In all these areas the technologic achievements are basically and almost entirely Western. They have little or nothing to do with so-called Socialist economy or Communist pretension. Their further development poses, nevertheless, certain dangers, particularly in significant breakthroughs capable of magnifying the military power of the imperio-colonial tyrant.

Behind the military technocracy in the U.S.S.R. lie deep weaknesses which no amount of nuclear blackmail or military display can hide. Before World War I the Russian Tsar virtually terrorized the capitals of Western Europe with the threat of the great Russian "steamroller," the vast imperial forces of the Russian Empire. Today, following in the paved traditions of Russian cold war diplomacy, Khrushchev threatens us and the world with "global missiles." He has been so effective in propagandizing the empire's military and space feats that in addition to naive and pacifist groups doing his work for him in the free nations, even our own leaders invoke from time to time the pangs of nuclearitis as an excuse for the absence of a well-defined and -developed cold war policy.<sup>14</sup>

But the innovation of present military-space technology in no way alters the persistent weaknesses in the armed services of the U.S.S.R. Complete and striking military power is not just a conglomeration of new weapons. The ultimate weapon is still man and his morale, loyalties and will. No one is more aware than Moscow of the overriding fact that, despite changing military technology, in all three major wars in this century the motley and multinational forces of

<sup>12</sup> "Action on the Creation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Aug. 10, 1961, pp. 14314-14316.

<sup>13</sup> See "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 8, 1961, pp. 3286-3311.

<sup>14</sup> "Text of President's News Conference," the Evening Star, Feb. 14, 1962, Washington, D.C.

<sup>9</sup> Dobriansky, Lev E. "History of Communist Aggression," report, Fort Leavenworth, Kans., 1961, pp. 14-22.

<sup>10</sup> George Vine, "I Killed for Russia," the Daily Mail, London, Nov. 18, 1961.

<sup>11</sup> Stewart Alsop, "The Berlin Crisis: Khrushchev's Weakness," the Saturday Evening Post, Dec. 16, 1961.

1952

6439

the Russian Empire, whether tsarist or Soviet, disintegrated early. In the Russo-Japanese and the two world wars political factors associated with the freedom of the Russian people and the independence of the non-Russian nations accounted for this record. About 43 percent of U.S.S.R.'s armed forces is non-Russian and, despite the fact that the Constitution of the U.S.S.R. calls for separate Republic war ministries, troops are carefully intermixed and dispersed.

Capitalization of this vital weakness into a vulnerability rests obviously on a broader program directed at the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. Along with this is the necessity for a full and superior development of all our arms, nuclear and conventional. We made a grave mistake in accepting a nuclear test ban, and disarmament in the realistic context of the cold war is a political myth. The only sure and safe way to preserve the gray peace and to move forward toward cold war victory is by attaining to unquestioned superiority along the entire spectrum of military technology and weaponry. Our economy can flexibly accommodate this; the empire economy of the U.S.S.R. cannot. In space, with 33 of our earth satellites as against 2 of theirs, we already enjoy an overall superiority. As in so many other respects, the Russians potentize their firsts and demonstrate in time their lack of depth. There is no common sense reason why we or the free world should cooperate and share our space discoveries with the Russian totalitarians. Whether we like it or not, even space is not excludable from the Russian cold war matrix.

#### THE PARTY

The final major area for SWV analysis is the party. Not unlike the Nazi Party under Hitler, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is the cohesive agent of totalitarian Soviet Russian strength. There are some 8 million in the party today, but this figure is misleading. Predominantly Russian, the party consists of members with families, relatives and associates who, though not members, share both material and spiritual interests in the strength and power of the party. And these number well over 25 million. The party, thus, is the strong vehicle for totalitarian rule in the Empire and subverting conspiracy beyond it.

However, it is not without weaknesses that, along with others, could not be developed into fatal vulnerabilities. The perennial problem of succession, intraparty feuding, the pressures of national parties in Ukraine, Georgia, and elsewhere, and infiltration of party councils and machinery lend themselves to such a development. Here, as elsewhere, our offensive in the cold war would necessarily have to be organic, composite and totalistic. Pursuing one weakness as against others would be both foolish and wasteful. But it will be noted that involved in each of these major weaknesses is the basic cross-sectional problem of the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. Can you now understand why for 3 years Khrushchev and his puppets have been violently attacking the Captive Nations Week Resolution? From the viewpoint of our cold war disadvantage, can you now understand why our State Department opposes this resolution and why our Presidents have with the utmost reluctance issued Proclamations of the Week every July?

These are facts, not academic theories and speculations inscribed in some newly written book. It was painful for me, as indeed to others, to see how thoroughly incapable our Vice President was in his encounter on these problems with Khrushchev in July 1959. It is equally painful to observe how, today, we continue to miss our opportunities for eventual cold war victory. However, I haven't the slightest doubt that with more shock treatments and an aroused citizenry

the dominant facts of international life and the predominant weaknesses of the Soviet Russian Empire will lead us to the pursuit of an inescapable policy of emancipation and a cold war strategy designed for decisive victory. All the elements, all the outlines for such a policy and strategy are available to us. All that is necessary is will, courage, and an understanding of the Soviet Russian Empire which, after all, is our prime foe and the world's cancer.

Mr. Speaker, "Thinking of the Russian People Regarding Their Leaders" was an interesting subject discussed by Senator James F. Murray, Jr., of New York City.

Senator Murray is now an international lawyer. He travels extensively and in the past 2 years, he has been behind the Iron Curtain twice. Mr. Murray has been awarded the Lateran Cross and the Italian Order of Merit for his international cultural activities.

The main address of the afternoon was given by the gentleman from New York, Hon. JOHN R. PILLION. Congressman PILLION has been a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives since the 83d Congress in 1950, and has been a leading western New York Congressman since that time. His interest in the democratic process has earned him the respect of his colleagues and the people of western New York. He is author of House Resolution 447, "A Declaration of War Against 98 Communist Parties," a psychomoral offensive against the international Communist conspiracy.

Congressman PILLION's speech, entitled "War, Survival and Peace," follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN R. PILLION, REPUBLICAN, OF NEW YORK, AT THE COLD WAR SEMINAR, UNIVERSITY OF BUFFALO, MARCH 31, 1962

Mr. Chairman, my compatriots, and my esteemed friends, you know about a month ago, the Young Republican Clubs held their national convention in Washington.

I was invited to participate in a panel discussion. The subject question was:

"Shall we make Communism a campaign issue?"

My initial answer was "Yes" and "No" and "Maybe."

Now, please do not conclude that this was a flippant politician's answer. Nor was it intended as an ambiguous Delphi oracle pronouncement.

Rather, my purpose was to emphasize the fact that the subject of communism is of such great magnitude, imbedded with so many variables and imponderables, permeated with so many complex policies, strategies and tactics, that it does not lend itself to a simple, categorical, definitive solution.

I don't suppose there is anyone in this room who has not given some apprehensive thought of how much radioactive materials our families may safely ingest through the air we breathe and the food we consume.

Each of us, I'm sure, has given some fleeting consideration to protective measures, including fallout shelters, against a possible nuclear attack.

This is tax-paying time. Fifty-five billion dollars, or 60 percent of the Federal budget of \$93 billion, is allocated for military and other defense purposes.

A reduction of 60 percent in our Federal taxes would be a most attractive prospect.

Today's newspapers are headlining the crises over Berlin, nuclear testing, disarmament, Dutch New Guinea, and South Vietnam.

Why, who, and what, threatens your life and mine?

Why, who, and what, threatens to destroy this Nation, and those cherished constitutional principles upon which it was founded?

Why, who, and what, is endangering the morality, the ethics, the political freedom, the religious bodies, the economies, of the free world of the Christian-Judaic concepts, of all Western civilization?

What is the common denominator in this sweeping, deliberate, devastation?

Is the Soviet Government the common denominator? The answer is "No."

Is it the basic principles and philosophies of Marx and Lenin?

Is it a historical inevitability?

Is it colonialism, or imperialism?

The answer in each case must be "No."

The common denominator is communism. The direct and immediate causative force is the international Communist conspiracy.

Despite our fears, despite our stark realization of the depth and imminence of our peril, we still know, relatively, nothing about this Communist enemy force.

As a corollary, and as a result, we know relatively, nothing about the principles, policies, strategies, and tactics needed to contain or destroy this enemy.

It is most discouraging for me to hear highly respected citizens, businessmen, professional men, educators, parrot and lend their support to pro-Communist causes. These men are loyal citizens. Their idealism exceeds their practical knowledge.

It is most disheartening to see our television networks, newspapers, and other communications media repeatedly serve the Communist cause.

But most frightening, and most frustrating, is to know that our highest Government officials, including the membership of the U.S. Congress, lack a basic knowledge and comprehension of the magnitude, the scope, the principles, the strategies, the tactics of this predatory force, the international Communist conspiracy.

In a representative republic, such as ours, public opinion does exert a direct and powerful effect upon governmental policies.

Cuba is a prime example of an American public opinion that brought about a pro-Communist result. The New York Times, Jack Paar, Ed Murrow, the Columbia and National Broadcasting Networks, share in this dishonorable distinction.

It is not essential that the American public have a profound and detailed knowledge of the complexities of communism.

It is essential, however, that the American public does understand the broad general principles of Communism. It is necessary for the American public to be able to recognize pro-Communist causes and pro-Communist actions.

It is vital that the leaders of our community, in our churches, in our schools, in our fraternal organizations, in our businesses, oppose, attack, and defend against those persons and those causes that are giving aid and comfort to the Soviet and to the international Communist conspiracy.

That is why this seminar is a superb public service. I take this opportunity to commend each of you for your devotion and sacrifice in the cause of freedom.

There is no community, social, recreational, or educational project that can compare with this in value and in importance.

The Buffalo Junior Chamber of Commerce has performed a great service in sponsoring, organizing and presenting this seminar.

The Niagara Frontier Chapter of the Association of the United States Army deserves our highest praise and deep appreciation for their cosponsorship.

Up until the last 5 years, this Nation was faced with the primary question of whether or not we had the will, the willingness to

make the necessary sacrifices, to defend our system, our Government of maximum freedoms, our highest living standards.

It is my judgment that we must, now, add another condition to this question. That is, "Can we win this war, even though we may be able to muster up our will to do so." I am not at all complacent about the answer.

The American people, collectively, and currently, are giving lip service to the ideals of freedom, survival, and peace. To most of us these words are merely vague, abstract concepts.

We cannot hope to resolve the constantly recurring crises confronting the free world without a careful examination and evaluation of freedom, survival, and peace as human aspirations and as national goals.

Our political, educational, and religious leaders have, in large measure, failed to grasp the significance of these universal ideals.

As a result, our people are confused and befuddled. Our Nation today lacks direction and purpose. It has lost its sense of destiny. It is helpless in the revolutionary storms surrounding it.

We must, as a people, as a nation, first establish priorities in value for freedom, survival, and peace.

A large segment of our population judges peace to be of supreme importance. They are the citizens who accept the pro-Communist slogan: "Peace at any price."

This attitude is reflected in our national policies, that too often materialize into appeasement, and the attempted bribery of the Communist-Soviet forces.

Another large segment of Americans consider survival to be all-important. This spirit is exemplified by another pro-Communist slogan: "Better Red than dead."

These Americans have forgotten that survival without freedom is servitude.

It is heartening to know that there is a third segment of the American people. It is they who accept freedom as the indispensable ingredient of man's existence.

Human history is a record of man's struggle to be free. This Nation was founded, not upon concepts of survival or peace. It was founded upon the concept of human freedom.

In order to effectively bear the burden of our world responsibility, this Nation must reestablish freedom as the keystone of our national purpose. It must be the rallying cry for the free world against the Communist dictatorship, not of the proletariat but over the proletariat.

We must never forget that freedom is indispensable, survival is crucial, peace is desirable.

There are those, including Mr. Khrushchev, who maintain that this country must choose between freedom, survival, or peace. I do not believe that we must necessarily sacrifice any one of these objectives in order to preserve the others.

I am convinced that a realistic approach by this Nation, and our people, to the causes of the world crises would realize freedom, secure survival, and attain an enduring, true peace for all humanity.

No sober-thinking American can fail to see that this world is in the midst of the greatest political, economic, social, and military crisis in all history.

The phenomenal sweep of Communist power is a gruesome fact of life. It immediately threatens our lives, our freedoms, our national existence.

If we reflect upon the past, assess the present, and look to the future, we cannot help but ask, "How long will it be—3, 10, or 15 years—before the United States becomes another captive nation of the Communist-Soviet Empire?"

The free world has been shocked and staggered by an uninterrupted series of Communist aggressions and victories.

Since 1939, country after country has fallen before the Communist offensive. Total power has been seized in Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, North Korea, Red China, North Vietnam, Outer Mongolia, Tibet, Cuba, and British Guiana.

Another 20 or more nations are on the verge of Communist seizure, ready to follow Communist direction and dictation.

Let us examine the causes of today's crises:

Why is communism winning?

Why have our policies failed?

Unless we immediately recognize our enemies, and fully comprehend the magnitude of the forces that seek our destruction, we shall very soon reach a point of "no return."

If we understand the Communist philosophy, its organization, its strategies, its tactics, we cannot fail to conclude that we are engaged in a life or death total global war.

It is a war of demoralization, disintegration, and destruction. It is a relentless, incessant war.

It is a war of indefinite duration, of orthodox and unorthodox methods.

It is a war being waged by a disciplined organization, combining new techniques conceived by that mad genius, Lenin.

This total war is a dual war, carried on in two separate campaigns.

The major campaign is being waged by the International Communist Conspiracy.

The Communist Internationale was established at Moscow in 1919. Ever since then, the International Communist Conspiracy has carried on a continuous campaign of infiltration, subversion, and all forms of revolutionary and guerrilla warfare.

It is not a conflict, it is not economic competition, it is not peaceful coexistence, it is not a cold or warm war. It is an all-out global war for total destruction.

It has mastered the techniques of political power seizure and quasi-military conquest.

This International Conspiracy consists of 98 Communist parties, all of whom are associated together in one common goal, the destruction of all non-Communist organizations, institutions, societies, and nations.

You may be interested to know that 3 of these Communist parties are in the United States; Communist Party United States, Communist Party Puerto Rico, Communist Party Hawaii.

The Communist parties have a force of 36 million disciplined, trained member agents, distributed throughout the world. They owe a single allegiance, not to any nation, not to any church, but solely to the Communist-Soviet conspiracy.

This alliance of Communist parties has repeatedly declared its incessant war against the free world.

At their last world conference December 1960 they adopted the Moscow Manifesto. It repledges all these parties to an intensified offensive against us.

Yet this nation, our people, the free world, cannot grasp the deadliness of this war.

We have failed to comprehend the nature, the totality, the scope, the strategies and tactics of the new forms of war.

We have allowed ourselves to become obsessed with only the minor phase of this war, the other part of the war carried on by the Soviet Government, the Soviet satellites and the Soviet associated nations.

If we look back upon the Communist advances, we will find that almost all of their success has been due, not to military power, but was achieved by the Communist techniques of political, psychomoral war.

The United States has in the past, and continues today, to wage a unilateral campaign for peace. The Communist forces have been waging a unilateral campaign of polit-

ical, psychomoral, diplomatic and economic war.

No one can dispute that we are steadily losing this war at an alarming and accelerating pace.

As a consequence of our lack of comprehension of the true nature of the Communist force, our foreign policies have completely failed to meet the realities and the practicalities of this war.

Our foreign policies have not materially changed in the past 30 years, under either Democrat or Republican administrations. Our policies have been, and are today, defensive, self-deceptive, and self-defeating.

Permit me to remind you of a few of these foreign policies:

For a long period of time, we relied upon military supremacy to contain the Communist drive. Yet our heaviest losses, all of middle Europe, Red China, were sustained in the period between 1945 and 1953 when the United States had a preponderant military superiority.

NATO and our other military alliances have had considerable value. However, they have not proven an effective answer to the Communist war of subversion.

You remember Mr. Dulles, and his theory of massive retaliation. Massive retaliation has not been the answer.

The world's reliance upon the United Nations has been shattered.

Summit meetings and endless negotiations have not even slowed down the Communist drive.

Foreign aid, President Eisenhower's atoms for peace plans, international loans, disarmament proposals, have all proven to be figments of our own gullibility.

Our foreign policy, in a broad sense, has been that of containment. It has had variations, such as bribery of the Communists, appeasement, negotiation, compromise and vacillation. The trouble is, they have not remained bribed.

All of our efforts have eventuated into retreat and surrender, bit by bit, nation by nation.

It is my conviction that the steady decline of United States power and prestige, coupled with the increase in Communist-Soviet power, is leading us to the grim and desperate alternatives of either:

Surrender, or a preventive thermonuclear war.

Our international posture is seriously threatened. Our allies in the free world, especially in Europe, are seriously questioning the quality of our leadership, the effectiveness of our policies. We face the possibilities of general demoralization and panic of the peoples of the free world.

I am hopeful and confident that there is a third alternative, beside those of surrender or war, if we possess the will to accept the realities of our situation.

We must find and adopt a course that will assure our people and the free world, not only peace, but survival, and above all, freedom.

This third alternative is contained in House Joint Resolution 447 which I introduced on June 12 of 1961.

This resolution proposes to meet and counter the Communist war with our own declaration of a political, economic, psychomoral war against the international Communist conspiracy.

The best testimonial I know for the resolution, is that Pravda, Izvestia, La Rubeshum, have printed four separate attacks upon me and this resolution.

It would be a war not of missiles and marching soldiers with bayonets.

It would not be a war against any government. It would meet the Communist war in the fourth dimension.

It proposes a war against our actual enemy, the 98 Communist Parties, consti-



1662

tuting the international Communist conspiracy.

This declaration would not create a new war. It realistically recognizes an existing war in which we are the No. 1 target.

We cannot hope to successfully defend this Nation if we ignore this war against us.

We cannot survive, if we limit ourselves to suffer all losses in this war, and allow all victories to go to the Soviet.

We cannot formulate effective policies to cope with Communist-Soviet aggressions, infiltrations, subversions, guerilla wars, unless we fully comprehend the magnitude of this war, identify our enemies, locate the deployment of its forces.

The United States cannot survive this war alone, nor can we win it alone. The resources of all the free world must be totally committed in this life and death struggle. The leadership must come from the United States. How can we expect other peoples to resist Communist threats and bribes, if we in the United States continue our policies based upon fiction and fantasy?

We must face the stark reality. The Communist philosophy allows no compromise. Our domestic programs must be subordinated to, and consistent with the all-important cause of survival.

Gentlemen, we are being warred upon. Let us recognize and declare it. Let us win it.

In the main, there are two fundamental requirements that this country must adopt if we are to survive.

These requirements are basic to the declaration of nonmilitary war. They must be met before we can take the offensive in a war upon the Communist Parties throughout the world.

The first requirement is that of military superiority. The Communist-Soviet mentality completely lacks Christian-Judaic ethics. It knows no moral or legal restraint. It respects only power and force.

We have permitted our military and retaliatory power to erode to a point where the Soviet has attained a relative parity.

The Soviet, today, is acknowledged to be superior in the fields of rocketry, space technology, and intercontinental missiles.

Its army of 150 divisions located west of the Urals, together with 60 satellite divisions, is vastly superior in number, in equipment, in training, to that of the free world.

Although the United States excels in its Air Force, its Navy, and its total atomic stockpile, the question of overall superiority, of total destructive firepower and war capability is in serious doubt.

Superiority would depend upon the strategy and the nature of war.

Unless we take immediate action to restore an unquestioned military supremacy, we are inviting national and international suicide.

This Nation should place our intercontinental missile program on a crash, 24-hour-per-day, 7-day-a-week basis.

We should proceed with full-scale atomic testing to further increase our atomic firepower and weapons system.

We must proceed full scale with the development and testing of the neutron bomb.

We should concentrate upon the development and production of a weapons system, not for clean fusion bombs, but for fission bombs having a maximum radioactivity and a low ceiling, to take advantage of the prevailing air currents over Russia.

I have personally urged Chairman Seaborg and the Atomic Energy Commission, over a long period, to take these steps.

They would be a salutary answer to Mr. Khrushchev's threats to launch his 100-megaton bomb.

Our Navy is technologically obsolete, with the exception of our Polaris submarines.

Although we had complete mastery of the seas in the Korean war, our Navy was almost helpless, except for maintaining our supply lines. That war decisively exposed the impotence of our existing naval strategy concepts.

We need a vast program to equip every naval vessel with both nuclear power and nuclear missiles.

This program would give the United States hundreds of movable missile bases dispersed around the world. This program would divert Soviet missiles away from the United States.

Our present concrete embedded missiles attract and invite a missile attack upon our land.

The recommendations of Governor Rockefeller and President Kennedy for the construction of fallout shelters by our citizens is a confession of the gravity of our situation.

We must be prepared not only to wage a war, and to win that war; but more important, we must strengthen ourselves to a degree that will prevent the inception of any kind of war.

Our military superiority should be maintained at a minimum ratio of 1.5 to 1 over the Soviet. A 2-to-1 ratio is preferable.

We have the wealth, the technology, the economy to attain and maintain this superiority.

It is a cheap price to pay for our survival.

In the field of international affairs, we need a complete reexamination, reevaluation, reorganization of our national goals, our foreign policies and our policymaking machinery.

There is an apparent complete failure of orientation and coordination between our military capabilities and our foreign policies.

Our foreign policies and military capabilities are interdependent and must be mutually supporting if we are to attain our national objectives. As Mao Tse-tung has repeatedly reminded us, foreign policy comes out of the muzzles of guns.

The fiascos of Cuba, under both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations is a classic example of the failures, the lack of coordination between the President's Office, the State Department, the Defense Department, the National Security Agency, and the Central Intelligence Agency.

A military supremacy, combined with a firm, tough, realistic foreign policy, is our last and only hope for survival.

I am, presently, preparing and drafting a bill to implement my resolution, House Joint Resolution 447. I hope to introduce this measure within the next 2 weeks.

It proposes to create a new Cabinet post and Department for International Political Affairs. It would centralize into one agency, the responsibility of coordinating the political efforts of our Government. Today, they are disjointed, uncoordinated, and spread throughout more than a score of Federal agencies.

This Department would also be directly and primarily charged with formulating, coordinating, and executing all political objectives in the international field.

The power to formulate political policies is too awesome a responsibility for any one man. The life of this Nation, of the free world, is dependent upon our international political decisions. This responsibility does not belong and should not be placed exclusively upon the occupant in the White House, whoever he may be.

We must not forget that the U.S. Constitution charges Congress with the responsibility for safeguarding the welfare of this Nation, to provide for its defense, to declare war, to regulate our Armed Forces.

That is why I will propose in my bill that the power and responsibility for international political decisions be placed not in the

Cabinet officer but in a Board, consisting of the following responsible public officials:

1. The Vice President, as Chairman.
  2. Secretary of Defense.
  3. Secretary of State.
  4. Secretary of Treasury.
  5. The Cabinet Officer, to be appointed by the President, upon the recommendation of the Board.
  6. The Speaker of the House of Representatives.
  7. The majority leader of the House of Representatives.
  8. The minority leader of the House of Representatives.
  9. The majority leader of the U.S. Senate.
  10. The minority leader of the U.S. Senate.
- The Cabinet Officer shall be the Executive Officer for the Board.

We must remember that, in essence, we are in a political war.

Military power, or weapons, per se, do not create wars.

The Communists clearly recognize that war is only another method of attaining political objectives.

Military power, can however, be used either to accelerate or reduce the possibilities of war. Military power gives shape, a time element, to political aims.

It is basic political aims or conflicts that create wars. That is why we must reanalyze, reevaluate, and completely overhaul and reorganize our present totally inadequate, totally ineffective, disorganized structure for formulating and effectuating our international political policies.

This proposal is not intended, nor would it actually, interfere with the President's powers. It is intended to fortify his powers, to strengthen his powers, to integrate the congressional responsibilities with those of the Executive, to give maximum public support to a unified political effort, to successfully defend this Nation's goals of freedom, survival, and peace.

We must never forget that freedom has never been free. Its price has always been vigilance, courage, sacrifice, and dedication.

Mr. DULSKI. At this point I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION].

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, it is a high privilege to join my distinguished colleague [Mr. DULSKI] in extending our highest praise to the Buffalo Junior Chamber of Commerce for sponsoring a cold war seminar in the city of Buffalo, on March 30 and 31. This seminar was an outstanding public service. It is evident that the general public, and our highest national leaders, continue to lack a basic understanding of the Communist conspiracy, its organization, its purposes, its strategies, and its tactics.

As a consequence of this lack of comprehension, the United States and the free world are steadily losing the total global war being waged by the Communist-Soviet forces.

Our policies are basically defensive and ineffectual. For the last 30 years, our approach to the Communist-Soviet offensive has been one of vacillation, accommodation, negotiation, compromise, bribery, appeasement, direct aid to Communists, and piecemeal retreat.

This country is under the tragic delusion that it can negotiate an honorable and effective disarmament agreement with the Soviet. We are deluding ourselves and the free world with dreams of a just and lasting peace.

We fail to understand that communism is basically and fundamentally a philosophy of war and destruction. It

cannot coexist with a system of free nations.

The essence of the Communist total global war is that of political penetration, political infiltration, political subversion, and political seizures.

The Communist-Soviet gains in this war have been so alarming that today, we face not the question of whether we have the will to win, but the added question of, Can we win this war, even if we can summon a united national will to win?

Mr. Speaker, I pay special tribute to Sheriff B. John Tutuska, and Mr. John R. Owen, Jr., for their great contributions as honorary chairman and general chairman of this seminar.

Our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN], delivered a most impressive keynote message.

Our esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN], delivered a most stirring and informative concluding address.

They are to be highly commended for their devotion and their sacrifice in the greatest of all causes—man's struggle to remain free.

I take this opportunity to publicly acknowledge the extensive and most valuable contributions made by my neighbor and colleague, Mr. DULSKI, to awaken this Nation to the Communist-Soviet war upon all free peoples, societies and nations.

Mr. Speaker, I note in today's newspapers that our Government is proposing to the 17-nation Geneva Conference a plan for partial disarmament. It would place the responsibility for peace upon the armed forces of the United Nations.

This is a tragic, monumental error. We are fanatically, and foolishly obsessed with disarmament and peace.

The freedom of our people, the survival of this Nation, the peace of the world lies not in reliance upon Communist-Soviet promises. It lies on our own strength, our power to defend the Nation.

We must never forget that wars are not the result of military forces. Wars and military forces result from political objectives. Our nuclear and military power are not contributing forces toward a war. Our military retaliatory power has been a preservative force for peace. Military might is not, in itself, a determinant of war. Our great danger lies not in the war powers of the Soviet forces. The basic threat to peace, the imminent danger of war, is caused by the inflexible and immutable political philosophy and political goals of the Communist Party and the Soviet nation to impose a Communist system upon every free nation.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the evening and concluding session of this very informative and effective seminar was chaired by Mr. Elmer Lux, former city councilman and president of the common council, and now serving in an executive position with the State of New York.

The major address was delivered by the Honorable AUGUST A. JOHANSEN, a Member of the House of Representatives from Michigan.

Representative JOHANSEN, who has been in Congress since 1955, is the second ranking member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. He is also a member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Congressman JOHANSEN is a former newspaperman and Congregational minister.

Congressman JOHANSEN's address appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 4, 1962, on page A2639.

I highly recommend the reading of the speeches made by Congressmen FEIGHAN and JOHANSEN at this seminar.

We, who live in the Niagara Frontier area, are very fortunate to have an active committee in this field—the United Anti-Communist Action Committee of Western New York.

On alert—long before Cuba became a Russian satellite and the Soviet Union polluted the atmosphere of the earth with atomic fallout, an earnest group of western New Yorkers formed a committee to alert the rest of us to the serious menace of world domination by the Communists. Since 1959 the United Anti-Communist Action Committee of Western New York—U.A.C.A.C. of W.N.Y.—has maintained a speakers bureau, and to date has given nearly 200 lectures to alert the people of western New York and Canada to the serious menace of world domination by the Communists.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. BECKWORTH, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. TOLL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 10 minutes, tomorrow, Thursday, April 19.

Mr. DOMINICK (at the request of Mrs. MAY), for 1½ hours, on May 9, 1962.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mrs. MAY), for 10 minutes, on April 19.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. PRICE in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WALTER.

Mr. GRIFFIN to revise and extend the remarks he made earlier today.

Mr. LIBONATI (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was given permission to extend his remarks following the remarks of Mr. STRATTON on his amendment to H.R. 11289.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois to extend his remarks immediately following the remarks of Mr. LIBONATI on the so-called Stratton amendment in proceedings in Committee of the Whole.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. MAY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DOOLEY.

Mr. ALGER in eight instances.

Mr. KILBURN.

Mr. BARRY.

Mr. FINO.

Mr. PILLION.

Mr. ADAIR in three instances.

Mr. WILSON of California in four instances.

Mr. UTT in two instances.

Mr. NORBLAD in two instances.

Mr. ELLSWORTH.

Mr. BRUCE.

Mr. MINSHALL in four instances.

Mr. HORAN in two instances.

Mr. MOSHER.

Mr. YOUNGER and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding it will exceed two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$225.

Mr. AVERY in two instances.

Mr. HESTAND in two instances.

Mr. MACGREGOR.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN in two instances.

Mr. OSMERS in three instances.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin.

Mr. ROUSSELOT.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN.

Mr. AYRES.

Mr. SIBAL.

Mr. FINDLEY in five instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI.

Mr. DURNO.

Mrs. BOLTON in two instances.

Mr. GLENN.

Mr. WIDNALL in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. CASEY in two instances.

Mr. PETERSON in two instances.

Mr. KOWALSKI in two instances.

Mr. VANIK in two instances.

Mr. MACK in two instances.

Mr. MULTER in two instances.

Mr. FLOOD.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania.

Mr. WICKERSHAM in two instances.

Mrs. KELLY.

Mr. HEMPHILL in two instances.

Mr. ASHMORE in two instances.

Mr. FRIEDEL in two instances.

Mr. BOLAND in two instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ.

Mr. JOELSON.

Mr. KEITH.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PURCELL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WALTER.

Mr. HEMPHILL in two instances.

Mr. KITCHIN in two instances.

Mr. FRIEDEL in two instances.

Mr. ASHMORE.

Mr. GLENN (at the request of Mrs. MAY), in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts and to include extraneous matter.

#### ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 11027. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and